



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,978	09/05/2006	Kaneo Chiba	B-6122PCT 623712-6	9335
36716	7590	08/12/2011	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY			CHOI, FRANK I	
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			1616	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/12/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,978	CHIBA ET AL.
	Examiner FRANK CHOI	Art Unit 1616
All Participants:	Status of Application: <i>response after final action</i>	
(1) <u>FRANK CHOI</u> .	(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Mavis Gallenson</u> .	(4) _____.	
Date of Interview: <u>09 August 2011</u>	Time: <u>5:00 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.		
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>		
Claims discussed: <i>Claim 3</i>		
Prior art documents discussed: <i>n/a</i>		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>		
Part III. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of rejections discussed: Rejection of claim 4 for lack of antecedent basis - the range of less than 200 nm is broader in scope than the mean diameter of about 140 nm (std deviation of about 30 nm) in claim 3 as claim 4 encompasses size distributions other than about 140 nm plus or minus about 30 nm.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Rejection of claim 4 for lack of antecedent basis - the range of less than 200 nm is broader in scope than the mean diameter of about 140 nm (std deviation of about 30 nm) in claim 3 as claim 4 encompasses diameters which are greater and smaller than about 140 nm plus or minus about 30 nm. The Examiner indicated that the language of claim 1 with respect to the inorganic shell and resulting inhibition of dissipation of the ozone nano-bubbles by said shell needed to be inserted into claim 3 in order to provide antecedent basis for the stopping of shrinking step in claim 4 and inhibition of diffusing in claim 5. The Applicant's representative indicated that she would have to discuss the issue with her client and that she would get back the examiner next week.